discovery and --

MS. KANE: Your Honor, we think it's just cleaner that, you know, since we don't have dates for the depositions for the DePriests and it sounds like we still have to resolve the FOIA issues before they're going to give us those dates, and then allow those depositions to proceed, that we have an order that says discovery closes six weeks from the date of the last deposition.

That gives us ample time to get the transcripts from the depositions as necessary to seek additional written discovery. Within our rules, at least, I believe it's interrogatories, are 14 plus the three days for service. So that's seventeen days right there, that's nearly a month of time.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well are these interrogatories going to parties or outside witnesses?

MS. KANE: If we were to serve

1	additional discovery, it's most like that
2	discovery would go to Maritime. But it's
3	possible
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we could
5	shorten the time for them.
6	MR. KELLER: Well, if I heard Ms.
7	Kane right, I mean, when you're talking about
8	the six weeks of the deadline, you're
9	incorporating in that time to respond to the
10	written discovery as well. When you said the
11	17 days, you're incorporating that?
12	MS. KANE: Well, it's my
13	understanding that we would need to be able to
14	serve discovery within a time period that
15	would allow the party to respond before the
16	close of discovery.
17	MR. KELLER: All right, I have no
18	problem with that.
19	MS. KANE: That is standard
20	practice, so we would ask, let's say the
21	depositions were December 1st and 2nd, that it
22	would be giv weeks from December 2nd would be

the close of discovery. But since we don't 1 have a deposition date from Maritime, we can't 2 plan what that six week date out would be. 3 Okay, get together 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: after this is over and agree to something with 5 6 Mr. Keller. And also, Mr. Chen, do you have any interest in this request for more time, 7 8 Mr. Chen? 9 MR. CHEN: Well --JUDGE SIPPEL: For your client? 10 MR. CHEN: -- our issue is just we 11 12 want to make sure that the Enforcement Bureau 13 has ample time for discovery. I want to make sure that Ms. Kane is able to garner the 14 information that she needs to assemble her 15 16 case. Well that 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. sounds like agreement. Well she will, you 18 19 know, you'll get a chance to take a look at 20 these dates. It can be faxed to you or the draft can be faxed to you or emailed to you 21 22 like everybody else in this case.

1	MR. CHEN: Right.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: And I will act on
3	it next week. So I could give a date certain,
4	why not have all this in by next Wednesday?
5	I know there's a holiday, but is that doable?
6	MS. KANE: If Mr. Keller is going
7	to be able to provide us with deposition dates
8	by next Wednesday.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well I'm figuring
10	that you will.
11	MR. KELLER: Well no, I understood
12	you're going to tee it to six weeks after the
13	deposition.
14	MS. KANE: Correct. But it was my
15	understanding that the Judge wanted a specific
16	date.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, that's what I
18	want to do.
19	MS. KANE: That's what he's asking
20	us to decide by next week and
21	MR. KELLER: Well, then that's
22	going to be a problem because we need to

1	resolve the FOIA matter before we set the
2	dates for the deposition.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well look, we can
4	always delay the deposition if you still have
5	a concern that's worthy of being a concern.
6	But I have to do something to move this
7	forward. This train isn't moving.
8	MR. KELLER: All right.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Give me the dates,
10	I'll set them down, and do you want to put a
11	qualifier on any, with a cover letter,
12	anything you want to do, but give me the
13	dates. Okay? And the same day, it would
14	apply to coming in with that language on the
15	protective order because you're probably going
16	to have to circulate that.
17	MALE PARTICIPANT: Yes, get some
18	input.
19	MR. KELLER: All right, so in that
20	case Wednesday's fine.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, what is the
22	date of Wednesday? The date of Wednesday is,

1	I've got a new calendar here but
2	MALE PARTICIPANT: The 28th.
3	MS. KANE: 28th.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: The 28th? Okay,
5	let me write that down, the 28th of November.
6	Now I should just tell you this as a matter of
7	passing, but I'm going to be out of the
8	country from the 17th of December until the
9	7th of January. That should not interfere
10	with anything that's going on here but like I
11	said, the last time I tried that I had the
12	Wireless Bureau contacting me on Christmas Eve
13	that they were taking my case back. And so
14	anything can happen these days. All right.
15	MS. KANE: Your Honor, can we
16	raise another thing with regard to the
17	schedule?
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, go ahead.
19	MS. KANE: Well, if you recall, we
20	had a kind of proposed prehearing schedule
21	that we proposed in May, I believe, and then
22	at our last prehearing conference, we raised

1	the concern that we were coming up right up
2	against the Game Show Network case, which had
3	originally been scheduled for hearing I think
4	at the end of January. And we were originally
5	scheduled to go to hearing at the end of
6	February.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Guess what
8	happened? It got delayed because of
9	discovery.
10	MS. KANE: I know they got
11	delayed. Correct, so
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Surprise, surprise.
13	MS. KANE: but at that point, I
14	believe you put our schedule into advance
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh.
16	MS. KANE: and have suggested
17	to us that we propose a new schedule. And
18	that's what prompted, we knew we would always
19	have to move the schedule. I think at this
20	point, rather than propose a full, complete
21	hearing schedule with exchange of trial briefs
22	and witnesses, what we would suggest Your

1	Honor consider is us proposing a schedule
2	where we did summary decision briefing first.
3	And if that was able to resolve the pending
4	issue, which is Issue G, then we wouldn't need
5	to proceed with going through the other steps
6	of exchange of documents, exchange of witness
7	lists, et cetera.
8	And we do believe that based on
9	discovery so far, that this is a case that
10	could be decided by Your Honor on summary
11	decision. So we would
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now you know you're
13	going to get opposition from me. You're going
14	to get opposition from Maritime, you're going
15	to get opposition from Mr. Havens.
16	MS. KANE: Well, we understand
17	that we might have opposition on the issue, on
18	the legal question, Your Honor, as to
19	permanent discontinue of construction.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Forget about the
21	legal issue, it's the issue of fact. You have
22	to

1	MS. KANE: I know.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: you know, you
3	have a standard with respect to having no
4	substantial issue of fact.
5	MS. KANE: I understand that, Your
6	Honor. I'm actually pretty confident that
7	Maritime and the Bureau could agree on the
8	fact that would be necessary for Issue G.
9	MR. KELLER: Your Honor
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: But what about Mr.
11	Havens?
12	MS. KANE: Well I don't know about
13	Mr. Havens, I mean, as you know, the Bureau
14	and Maritime have agreed with regard to
15	construction on the Watercom issues for
16	summary judgement, which raised the 93 boxes
17	question, but I think based on the discovery
18	that we've had so far and certainly Mr.
19	Keller's earlier understanding that he would
20	be willing to stipulate on the service date
21	issue, we might very well be in a position

where this case could be resolved on summary

1	decision, or at least we should go down that
2	path first rather than going through a full
3	blown hearing schedule in preparing for
4	hearing before we determine whether that is
5	necessary.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, let's
7	put that question in, we'll table that
8	question for now. The only thing I'm looking
9	for are dates with respect to these DePriest
10	depositions. And everything else is going to
11	get left pending
12	MS. KANE: And the close of
13	discovery.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, if I
15	said that everything is advance pending Game
16	Show, and that's after then fine, let's leave
17	it that way. Okay? Is that all right with
18	you?
19	MS. KANE: I mean obviously
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's not disrupting
21	anybody.
22	MS. KANE: It's not disrupting

1	obviously, you know, if it's something that we
2	think we could resolve on summary judgement,
3	would you be concerned about us filing that
4	prior to it?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, no, what,
6	prior to these depositions? These are
7	depositions. That's all we're talking about.
8	MS. KANE: Okay, well all I'm
9	saying, Your Honor, is that I think we could
10	agree to the depositions and a close of
11	discovery. And then what you're saying is we
12	would hold in abeyance any further dates?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Exactly.
14	MS. KANE: Okay.
15	MR. KELLER: But, and as I also
16	understood, that wouldn't preclude either
17	party from filing a summary decision.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Of course not.
19	MS. KANE: That's all we were
20	asking.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Good question.
22	MR. KELLER: Because I agree with

Ms. Kane, I think we are going to be able to stipulate to most of the facts. I mean, it's going to be a knock down, drag out fight with the legal interpretation of those facts.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well I've got a lot of assistants now, I don't have to do knock down drag outs anymore. Okay, but we're set on what has to be done, right? By next Wednesday I'm going to get dates, I'm going to do with the DePriest depositions and then if you want to have a closing discovery agreed to, that's fine. And I'm going to have language with respect to amending the protective order for consideration.

Okay, let's move on. The glossary, the glossary. I think we could go down line by line but I don't intend to do that. What we have is, the problem we have I think is the, what does construction mean? And this question that Mr. Havens raises about, is a series of set sites that come into play as a system. I don't know how that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	should get into what a definition of
2	constructive means, but let me hear, I don't
3	know where to start on this one. Let me hear
4	from Maritime on this.
5	MR. KELLER: Your Honor, I think
6	where we are in the glossary, and we talked
7	about this in a conference call yesterday with
8	Ms. Kane and the Havens parties
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well yes, she's
10	picking up the phone
11	MR. KELLER: Oh yes.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: okay, Ms. Kane,
13	thank you. All right. You had me worried
14	there for a minute.
15	MR. KELLER: I think we're at a
16	big philosophical, at least Ms. Kane and I are
17	at a big philosophical difference about the
18	reason we've been unable to agree to many of
19	these terms is that I have certain rulings
20	that said to stipulate to an awful lot of
21	things factually. I believe there's been

enough discovery now we know what the facts on

1 the ground are. For example, you know, we can 2 facility was constructed and say а providing with capable 3 operational, of service. 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: What do you mean by 5 6 constructed when you say constructed? 7 MR. KELLER: I mean built, I mean the whole thing was put up and plugged in, 8 9 it's operational, it's capable of providing 10 two way service to mobile units. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well can't you have 11 12 something instructed before it becomes 13 operational? Don't you have to turn the key 14 or something? Well, in this exact 15 MR. KELLER: statement, as we stated in prior discovery 16 17 requests, in this particular service and the way this thing, that's one at the same time. 18 I mean, what would happen in the day is the 19 stations would get constructed, then it would 20 21 be put on the air, they would be operational.

At that point the Commission would be notified

the construction was complete. So no, I don't, there's not a distinction between constructed and operational.

I mean, if there's something that renders the station inoperable, then it's not constructed, you know? In fact, what we provided in discovery, there were certain stations we classified as temporarily discontinued, precisely because they were incapable of operating right now because of lost utilities.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's say after the fact of.

MR. KELLER: Yes, but here's the point. On a lot of these definitions, constructed being one of them, operation being another one, what means operation, we're willing to stipulate to an awful lot of fact, but what we're not willing to stipulate is the legal conclusions to be drawn from those facts. Ms. Kane, and constructed is perhaps not the best example, we weren't allowed to

1	talk about operational.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well that's the one
3	that I'm stuck on.
4	MR. KELLER: Okay.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, right now
6	I'm stuck on that.
7	MR. KELLER: Well I don't know
8	that we have a dispute with the Bureau on
9	constructed.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well what about Mr.
11	Havens though?
12	MR. KELLER: We haven't conceded
13	with Mr. Havens on a number of scores. He,
14	number one, the system thing you're talking
15	about. It is true that the Maritime service,
16	the AMTS service, was originally conceived of
17	as a system of licenses, okay? And in fact,
18	later on they started doing them all under one
19	call sign and
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now you're waving
21	your hands up, you mean a system being like
22	you have them in five different communities

down the coast, something like that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. KELLER: Yes. For example, the Watercom licenses are all up and down the Mississippi and Ohio River. And that was a system of licenses, and there were at the time, certain rules the Commission had about how many stations you had, a minimum number of stations and the coverage you had. And they also had rules regarding what was called continuity of service, which essentially required there to be contiguous coverage from station to station. So as a barge moved up the river, you know, it would constantly be in range of, so that's true that historically that was there.

What Mr. Havens has been asserting, at least in the SkyTel O-filing that was recently, it was made shortly before this last counsel departed, was that if one of those stations is terminated for any reason, then the whole system falls apart. And he's also been stating, so that's number one. I

1	mean, the connection between whether the
2	stations are valid, that's not our
3	understanding. Our understanding is the
4	Commission has, in fact, in the past, in the
5	case of Maritime and some of these various
6	licenses, has terminated the licenses to the
7	location, one or two locations, but has not
8	terminated the whole system license.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is it a system
10	license that is issued? IS that what you get?
11	MR. KELLER: Well, it was
12	originally licensed as a system license. I
13	think a lot has changed when the Commission
14	went to geographic licensing and
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute, wait
16	a minute, you're still leaving me fuzzy here.
17	The license is going to identify some
18	frequency and some location. Are they
19	identifying the location by way of a specific
20	station?
21	MR. KELLER: Different location,
22	numerous locations, almost like a

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: On one license.
2	MR. KELLER: On one license, with
3	the exception of Watercom that's individual
4	licensing because that was done a long time
5	ago. But for instance, WRB 374 is an example.
6	The call sign WRB 374, which is at issue in
7	this station, is a license. And if you look
8	at the license, it will have location numbers
9	going down the frequencies. Now what I am
10	saying to you is that, and if you look at
11	that, you will see that the numbers, there are
12	gaps missing in the numbers.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
14	MR. KELLER: And that's because
15	some of the stations were not constructed
16	originally and some of the stations were later
17	terminated. But it didn't invalidate the
18	whole license.
19	MR. PLACHE: It's not a situation
20	where
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: This better move
22	forward.

1	MR. PLACHE: It's not a situation
2	where you have to have every location
3	operational in order for any location to be
4	legal. You don't lose the right to 20
5	locations if one location goes up in the air.
6	MR. HAVENS: Well, I mean, Your
7	Honor
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait a minute, Mr.
9	Havens, we're not
10	MR. PLACHE: Is that Mr. Havens'
11	counsel talking or
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, that's Mr.
13	Havens.
14	MR. PLACHE: Okay.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead.
16	MR. HAVENS: Your Honor
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Wait, wait, we're
18	hearing from Pinnacle.
19	MR. HAVENS: Okay.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: He's not finished
21	yet.
22	MR. HAVENS: That's fair.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. PLACHE: It's a situation
2	where there are multiple locations on one
3	license. So there's one call sign, it will
4	have multiple locations. In the case of WRB
5	374, there's locations all the way up and down
6	the East Coast.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: So what does that
8	do
9	MR. PLACHE: There's no condition
10	on the license that every single location has
11	to be operational or all locations are lost.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what about
13	this
14	MR. PLACHE: That's short of a,
15	that's a concept I've never heard before in
16	years of practicing law.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well what about
18	this, well, I'm only relying on, I only have
19	to concern myself with what's an Issue G has
20	and can set down for a hearing. And Issue G
21	says, to determine whether Maritime
22	constructed or operated any of its stations at

1	variance with Sections 1.95 and 8.49.
2	Now does that means it's got to
3	be, if one station goes out, that if they got
4	four other stations that are operating within
5	the system that the individual station is not
6	a problem, for purposes of this case?
7	MS. KANE: Your Honor, that's what
8	I understand Mr. Havens is arguing, but I'm
9	not sure that the precedence supports that.
10	But I think
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well as I
12	understand, well wait just a minute
13	MR. PLACHE: I'm not sure
14	everybody's clear about that.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Was I stating that
16	correctly for you?
17	MR. PLACHE: I don't know that I
18	understood your question
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Or let me say it
20	this way, you've got a system and it's got
21	five stations up and down the coast, okay?
22	For some reason or another one of them is

1	discontinued, whether it, because of a
2	business reason or because whatever reason,
3	it's discontinued. And once you get a license
4	you're supposed to keep a station operating
5	unless you get permission from the Commission.
6	My question is, can the system still operate
7	as a system with four of the five?
8	MR. PLACHE: Well, if it's
9	operating as a system, yes. I don't think
10	there's a requirement that it operate as a
11	system. I don't think that there's a
12	requirement that every station on the license
13	has to be operational or any single station,
14	to be valid.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, in my
16	hypothetical, the one that's not operating,
17	it's in violation of the license provision, is
18	that correct?
19	MR. PLACHE: If it's not
20	operating?
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's not operating.
22	MR. PLACHE: I don't know that I

1	would use the violation, it means it's not
2	operational. And if it's permanently
3	discontinued, then that one location should
4	then be taken off the license.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you turn a
6	license back to the Commission so that
7	MR. PLACHE: Not the license.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: The license, no?
9	MS. KANE: Just the location, Your
10	Honor.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Just the location.
12	MR. PLACHE: See, you've got
13	licenses with one call sign that will have 30
14	locations or more.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: But that's what
16	you've told me.
17	MR. PLACHE: Yes.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: But let me ask you
19	
20	MR. PLACHE: You don't turn the
21	whole license back, you just, that one
22	location is gone. It's permanently abandoned.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, so, okay.
2	MR. PLACHE: Maybe the hurricane
3	came and now that town is -
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's right,
5	that's right.
6	MR. PLACHE: completely
7	underwater, it got washed away
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Good example.
9	MR. PLACHE: it's gone.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now what this issue
11	says, to determine whether Maritime
12	constructed or operated any of its stations at
13	variance. And I'm saying, it doesn't say
14	anything about a system here.
15	MR. PLACHE: That's correct. I
16	don't think we should get hung up on the word
17	system.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.
19	MR. PLACHE: Okay.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: That satisfies me.
21	Now, Ms. Kane.
22	MS. KANE: I think this is what